



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,315	04/16/2004	Hirokazu Sakai	252003US0	7876
22850 7590 08/07/2007 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER DELCOTTO, GREGORY R	
			ART UNIT 1751	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 08/07/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/825,315	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SAKAI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Gregory R. Del Cotto	<b>Art Unit</b> 1751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE filed 5/29/07.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 6 and 8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4 and 6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 1751

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1, 4, 6, and 8 are pending. Claims 2, 3, 5, and 7 have been canceled.

Applicant's arguments and amendments filed 4/24/07 have been entered.

Claim 8 is withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 7/17/06.

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/29/07 has been entered.

### **Objections/Rejections Withdrawn**

The following objections/rejections set forth in the Office action mailed 2/28/07 have been withdrawn:

The rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai et al (US 2006/0036046) or Sakai et al (US 2004/0156815) has been withdrawn due to the filing of a translation of the priority document.

### ***Priority***

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

***Claim Objections***

Claims 1, 4, and 6 are objected to because of the following informalities:

With respect to claim 1, claim 7, it is suggested that Applicant delete the parentheses enclosing the text beginning with "(wherein, R...". Parentheses are not proper in the claims.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical

Art Unit: 1751

Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 1751

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO97/35548 in view of EP 1,166,766 and Hoshowski et al (US 5,137,715).

'548 teaches hair conditioning shampoo compositions containing a specific surfactant component comprising an ethoxylated alkyl sulfate surfactant having from about 1 to about 8 moles of ethoxylation and an amphoteric surfactant with insoluble, dispersed, nonionic silicone and a select soluble cellulosic cationic polymer hair conditioning agent. See Abstract. The alkyl ether sulfates contain an alkyl group of from about 8 to about 24 carbon atoms and have 1 to 8 moles of ethoxylated units. Highly preferred alkyl ether sulfates are those comprising a mixture of individual compounds, said mixture having an average alkyl chain length of from about 10 to about 16 carbon atoms and an average degree of ethoxylation of from about 1 to about 4 moles of ethylene oxide. See page 6, lines 1-22.

'548 does not teach the use of an amphiphatic amide lipid or a composition having the specific pH containing an amphiphatic amide lipid, a mixture of alkyl ether sulfate surfactants, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims.

'766 teaches dermatologic preparations capable of exerting excellent effects of maintaining normal barrier functions of the horny layer, restoring and reinforcing damaged barrier functions, heightening water retention of the horny layer and remedying skin chapping, and novel diamide derivatives having such effects. Suitable

Art Unit: 1751

diamides include those having the same general formula as formula (1) of the instant claims. The cosmetics may be formulated into various forms such as W/O and O/W emulsion cosmetics such as hair cosmetics including hair conditioners, shampoos, etc. The amide may be used in amounts of 0.01 to 20% by weight. See page 6, lines 45-60. The hair cosmetic may contain surfactants such as anionic surfactants, cationic surfactants, nonionic surfactants, and amphoteric surfactants including alkyl ether sulfates, etc. These surfactants may be used in amounts from 5 to 30% by weight. See para. 24.

Hoshowski et al teach a hair shampoo-conditioner composition including an anionic cleansing surfactants, such as alkyl sulfate or an alkyl ether sulfate, and a polymeric conditioning compound, in a suitable carrier, and having a pH of from about 2.5 to less than 7, to cleanse the hair. See Abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use an amphiphatic amide lipid in the composition taught by '548, with a reasonable expectation of success, because '766 teaches the advantageous properties imparted to a similar shampoo composition when using an amphiphatic amide lipid.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate the composition as taught by '548 at a pH as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Hoshowski et al teach formulating similar shampoo compositions at a pH which is the same as recited by the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a composition having the specific pH containing an amphiphatic amide lipid, a mixture of alkyl ether sulfate surfactants, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of '548 in combination with '766 suggest a composition having the specific pH containing an amphiphatic amide lipid, a mixture of alkyl ether sulfate surfactants, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims.

Claims 1, 4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 1,166,766 in view of WO97/35548 and Hoshowski et al (US 5,137,715),

'766 is relied upon as set forth above. However, '766 does not teach the use of a mixture of alkyl ether sulfates, a cationic cellulose polymer, or a composition having the specific pH containing an amphiphatic amide lipid, a mixture of alkyl ether sulfate surfactants, a cationic polymer, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims.

'548 and Hoshowski et al are relied upon as set forth above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate the composition as taught by '766 at a pH as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Hoshowski, teach formulating similar shampoo compositions at a pH as which is the same as recited by the instant claims.



Art Unit: 1751

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use a mixture of alkyl ether sulfate surfactants in the composition taught by '766, with a reasonable expectation of success, because '548 teaches the use of a mixture of alkyl ether sulfate surfactants in a similar shampoo composition and further, '766 teaches the use of alkyl ether sulfate surfactants in general.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use a cationic polymer in the composition taught by '766, with a reasonable expectation of success, because '548 teaches that cationic polymers serve as conditioning agents for hair in a similar shampoo composition and further, '766 teaches the use of various optional ingredients which would encompass cationic polymers.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a composition having the specific pH containing an amphiphatic amide lipid, a mixture of alkyl ether sulfate surfactants, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of '766 in combination with '548 and Hoshowski et al suggest a composition having the specific pH containing an amphiphatic amide lipid, a mixture of alkyl ether sulfate surfactants, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 4, 6, and 7 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of copending Application No. 10/743836 and claims 1-10 of 11/245071. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-9 of copending Application No. 10/743836 and claims 1-10 of 11/245071.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a composition containing an amphiphatic amide lipid, a mixture of alkyl ether sulfate surfactants, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components,

Art Unit: 1751

because claims 1-9 of copending Application No. 10/743836 and claims 1-10 of 11/245071 of suggest a composition containing an amphiphatic amide lipid, a mixture of alkyl ether sulfate surfactants, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Response to Arguments***

With respect to WO97/35548 and '766, Applicant states that none of these references discloses or suggest a composition containing ethylene oxide ether sulfates having at least 70% by weight of sulfates where  $a=0-2$ , nor quantify the amounts as claimed of sulfate where  $a=0$ ,  $a=1$ , and  $a=2$ . Additionally, Applicant states that '548 and '766 fail to disclose or suggest the claim limitation of a pH of 1 to 5 at 25 degrees Celsius when diluted to 20 times its weight with water and that Hoshowski et al, while teaching that the final pH of the composition is from 2.5 to less than 7, does not teach a pH of from 1 to 5 when diluted to 20 times its weight with water. In response, note that, the Examiner maintains that the broad teachings of '548 or Hoshowski et al suggest compositions containing the same distribution of sulfate surfactants as recited by the instant claims. Note that, the Examiner asserts that Applicant has not provided data which is commensurate in scope with the instant claims (see below for discussion) showing the criticality with respect to the specific distribution of sulfate surfactants as recited by the instant claims.

Art Unit: 1751

Further, the Examiner maintains that compositions as taught by '548 and '766, when formulated at a pH as directed and suggested by Hoshowski et al, would have a pH which overlaps with the pH recited by the instant claims when diluted to 20 times its weight with water. For example, a composition as taught by '548 or '766 formulated at a pH of 3.5 or 3 as directed by Hoshowski would have a pH which is the same or similar to the pH of the compositions appearing in Examples 1-3 on page 29 of the instant specification. These compositions would then be expected to have a pH of from 1 to 5 at 25 degrees Celsius when diluted to 20 times its weight with water as recited by the instant claims. Thus, the Examiner maintains that the teachings of '548 or '766, both in combination with Hoshowski, would suggest compositions having the same pH at 25 degrees Celsius when diluted to 20 times its weight with water as recited by the instant claims.

Additionally, Applicant once again states that data has been presented in the instant specification which shows the unexpected and superior properties of the claimed invention in comparison to compositions falling outside the scope of the instant claims. Specifically, Applicant states that the composition as recited by the instant claims demonstrates unexpected improvement in foaming speed in comparison to compositions falling outside the scope of the instant claims. In response, note that, the Examiner once again asserts that the data presented is not sufficient to place the instant claims in condition for allowance. The data presented is not commensurate in scope with the composition as recited by the instant claims. The data shows results with respect to only one specific amphiphatic amine lipid at one specific amount while

Art Unit: 1751

claim 1 is open to any amount of amphiphatic amine lipid which is not commensurate in scope with the instant claims. Additionally, for example, claim 1 recites a range of 5 to 30% by weight of sulfate surfactants and any cationic polymer in any amount while the data shows results with respect to sulfates at only 10% by weight and two specific cationic polymers in two specific amounts, which is not commensurate in scope with the instant claims.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory R. Del Cotto whose telephone number is (571) 272-1312. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

Art Unit: 1751

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on (571) 272-1029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
Gregory R. Del Cotto  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1751

GRD  
August 1, 2007